

### REMARKS

In an Office Action mailed on January 8, 2008, claims 39, 41-43, 45-47, 49 and 50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Claus in view of England.

The Examiner purportedly relies on Claus to teach or suggest in response to a request to provide an identification of a second computer system, notifying a user of the second computer system of the request and prompting the user to allow or deny the request. However, as previously pointed out by Applicant, Claus fails to teach or suggest the above-referenced claim limitations. More specifically, there is no teaching or suggestion in Claus regarding notifying a user of an identification request and prompting the user whether to allow or deny the request. Instead, Claus merely discloses providing a challenge signal. Based on the smart card's response to the challenge, another card authenticates or fails to authenticate the first card.

Thus, there is no discussion in Claus regarding any indication to a user of the smart card of the ongoing process, such as providing and authenticating the challenge number. Without this disclosure, Claus fails to teach or suggest the act of providing any type of interface on a computer system to notify both a user of a second computer system of the request and prompt the user to allow or deny the request, whether the interface is visual or not.

The missing claim limitations are neither taught nor suggested by England. In this regard, the cited language from lines 15-27 in column 12 of England merely discloses a pop-up box 802 to inform a guide that a client is requiring assistance. This disclosure, however, does not teach or suggest notifying a user of an identification request, nor does the cited language teach or suggest prompting a user to allow or deny such an identification request.

Therefore, for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 39 overcomes the § 103 rejection.


Similarly, independent claim 47 overcomes the § 103 rejection for at least the reason that there is no teaching or suggestion in the hypothetical combination of Claus and England of a first computer to, in response to an identification request from a second computer, provide a visual interface on the first computer to notify both a user of the first computer of the request and prompt the user to allow or deny the request.

Dependent claims 40-42, 44-46 and 48-50 are patentable for at least the reason that these claims depend from allowable claims.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant requests a favorable action in the form a Notice of Allowance. The Commissioner is authorized to pay any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-1504 (ITL.0160US).

Respectfully submitted,



Fred G. Pruner, Jr., Reg. No. 40,779  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
1616 S. Voss Road, Suite 750  
Houston, TX 77057  
713/468-8880 [Phone]  
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Date: April 8, 2008

Attorney for Intel Corporation